



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Handwritten mark

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,973	02/06/2004	Christopher J. Davenport	200315375-1	7317
22879 7590 05/01/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER TRUONG, THANHNGA B	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/773,973

Applicant(s)

DAVENPORT ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU2135

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on February 6, 2004. Claims 1-24 are pending. At this time, claims 1-24 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on February 6, 2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 2-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: independent claim 1 is claiming a system, whereas dependent claims 2-8 are claiming the computer system. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 12 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

a. *Referring to claims 1-5:*

Claim 12 recites "wherein the SSO server is implemented as software stored in the storage and executed by the client workstation's CPU." This claim is clearly directed toward a software program and it is non-statutory as not being tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Therefore, claim 12 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 20 recites "a method using SSO server" This claim is clearly directed toward a software program and it is non-statutory as not being tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Therefore, claim 20 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 21-24 are depended on claim 20, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 20 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biswas et al (US 7,174,383 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Biswas teaches a system, comprising:

(1) a client workstation (see Figure 1, elements 104 and 108 of Biswas);

(2) a single sign-on ("SSO") server accessible to the client workstation (see Figure 1, elements 112, 104, and 108 and column 4, lines 7-16 of Biswas);

(3) a plurality of host servers accessible to the client workstation (see Figure 1, elements 114, 116, and 118 and column 3, line 14, lines 32-33 of Biswas);

(4) wherein access by the client workstation to a first host server causes the client workstation to be automatically re-directed to the SSO server and the SSO server causes the client workstation to request sign-on credentials from a user if the user has not signed on to any of the host servers, and wherein the first host server, not the SSO server, authenticates the user (see abstract and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 8; column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) upon being re-directed to the SSO server, the first host server supplies the SSO server with security information that is used to encrypt sign-on credentials (**column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas**).

b. Referring to claim 3:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) wherein the user's sign-on credentials are stored in the client workstation (**column 3, lines 25-30 of Biswas**).

c. Referring to claim 4:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) wherein the user's sign-on credentials are stored in the SSO server (**column 4, lines 40-42 of Biswas**).

d. Referring to claim 5:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) after the first host server authenticates the user, the client workstation accesses a second host server which causes the client workstation to be automatically re-directed to the SSO server, and wherein the SSO server causes the sign-on credentials to be retrieved and used by the second host server to authenticate the user without the user supplying additional sign-on credentials (**see abstract and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 8; column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas**).

e. Referring to claims 6 and 7:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 3 and 4, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 4 above. Furthermore, cookie is stored in the web browser for later use. The next time user go to the same website, user's browser will send the cookie to the web server. as shown in Figure 2 of user computer. In addition, token is cookie (**column 3, lines 60-64 of Biswas**).

f. Referring to claim 8:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) after requesting sign-on credentials from the user, the client workstation is automatically re-directed back to the first host server to authenticate the user (**see abstract and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 8; column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas**).

g. Referring to claim 9:

i. Biswas teaches a client workstation configured to access any one or more of a plurality of services (see Figures 1 and 2 of Biswas), comprising:

(1) a CPU; an input device coupled to the CPU; and storage coupled to the CPU (see Figures 1-2 and column 3, lines 8-19; column 4, lines 17-34 of Biswas), said storage containing a browser that is executed by the CPU and that causes the workstation to:

(2) browse to a service that runs in a host server (see Figure 2, element 202 and column 4, lines 25-28 of Biswas);

(3) automatically re-direct to a single sign-on ("SSO") server; and permit the host server to authenticate a user either by requiring the user to enter credentials via the input device if the user has not already signed-on to a service and providing the credentials to the host server or, without the user entering credentials, by providing credentials previously stored in the storage to the host server if the user has already signed-on to a service and providing the credentials to the host server (**see abstract and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 8; column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas**).

h. Referring to claim 10:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) the CPU (**column 3, lines 8-19**) further causes the workstation to be re-directed back to the service to permit the host server to authenticate the user (**see abstract and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 8; column 3, lines 65 through column 4, line 17 of Biswas**).

i. Referring to claim 11:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) wherein the credentials are encrypted and stored in the storage (**column 4, lines 14-16 and lines 40-42 of Biswas**).

j. Referring to claim 12:

i. Biswas further teaches:

(1) wherein the SSO server is implemented as software stored in the storage and executed by the client workstation's CPU (**column 3, lines 45-50 of Biswas**).

k. Referring to claims 13-19:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1-12, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

l. Referring to claims 20-24:

i. These claim consist a computer program product for making trust management determinations to implement claims 1 and 9, they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Bhatia et al (US 2005/0039008 A1) discloses a system that facilitates end-to-end identity propagation to a backend-tier application that is not single sign-on enabled (see abstract). Claims 1-24 of the instant invention are also met on these paragraphs [0007] and [0022-0035] of Bhatia.

b. Bivens et al (US 2003/0226036 A1 discloses a method and apparatus for single sign-on authentication (see Title of Bivens).

c. Fang et al (US 6,240,512 B1) discloses single sign-on (SSO) mechanism having master key synchronization (see Title of Fang).

d. Miller et al (US 2003/0105981 A1) discloses a system and method for single session sign-on (see Title of Miller).

Art Unit: 2135

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU2135

TBT

April 27, 2007